



SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/014,911	02/08/93	DAVIS	W 15444
			NGUYEN, EXAMINER
32M1/0701			
THE WHITAKER CORP. 4550 NEW LINDEN HILL RD. SUITE 450 WILMINGTON, DE 19808			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER 3202 5
DATE MAILED:			07/01/94

**This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS**

- ☐ This application has been examined ☒ Responsive to communication filed on 4/7/94 ☐ This action is made final.
- A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

1. ☒ Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.
2. ☐ Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
3. ☐ Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.
4. ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152.
5. ☐ Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.
6. ☐ _____

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claims 1-20 are pending in the application.
- Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.
2. ☐ Claims _____ have been cancelled.
3. ☐ Claims _____ are allowed.
4. ☒ Claims 1-20 are rejected.
5. ☐ Claims _____ are objected to.
6. ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.
7. ☐ This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.
8. ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948).
10. ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____, has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner; ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been ☐ approved; ☐ disapproved (see explanation).
12. ☐ Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received ☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.
13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
14. ☐ Other _____

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Art Unit 3202

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

~~1. Claims 3 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Asick et al.~~

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14 and 16-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Admitted Prior Art [Roberts, Ollson, Buchter et al] in view of Asick et al.

It would have been obvious at the time applicant's invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide ramp wiping surfaces on a mating end for each of the Admitted as Prior Art [APA] connector housings in view of Asick's teachings of front ramp wiping surfaces which are offset laterally from conductive contact surfaces 80. The ramp wiping surfaces as taught by Asick et al. would provide wiping for only outside edge portions of each contact of a mating connector for the APA

Art Unit 3202

devices prior to contact engagement.

2. Claims 5 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claims 1 and 11 above, and further in view of Yamamoto.

It also would have been obvious at the time applicant's invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide power contacts in combination with signal contacts for the APA devices in view of Yamamoto's teachings of power and signal contacts in one connector housing. The use of "power" contacts in combination with signal contacts are old and well known in the art.

3. Claims 10 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claims 1 and 11 above, and further in view of Van Dijk.

It also would have been obvious at the time applicant's invention was made to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provide contacts having raised conductive surfaces for the APA devices in view of Van Dijk's teaching of contact 2 having raised conductive surfaces. Raised conductive surfaces would provide better electrical connections between the mating contacts.

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are deemed to be moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Serial No. 08/014,911

-4-

Art Unit 3202

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Examiner Khiem Nguyen at telephone number (703) 308-1738.

KHIEM NGUYEN



Nguyen/tnt
June 28, 1994